DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 953 UD 025 971

AUTHOR Cheng, Maisy L.
TITLE Who Seeks the Work? A Pre-Employment Pilot Survey.
INSTITUTION Toronto Board of Education (Ontario). Research Dept.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-88881-192-6
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 43p.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; *Employment Opportunities; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Ethnic Groups; Foreign Countries; Job Placement; *Minority Groups; *Occupational Mobility; *School Personnel; Sex Stereotypes; Tenure; Whites
IDENTIFIERS *Toronto Board of Education ON

ABSTRACT

The Board of Education in Toronto, Canada, has adopted equal employment policies and plans to increase the number of racial minorities employed by the school system. To determine the success of these actions the Board collected post-employment data in 1986. The following findings are reported: (1) most applicants for positions were not currently employed by the Board; (2) newspapers were the major source of job information; (3) the proportion of visible minorities who sought appointments was consistent with estimates of these minorities in the local population; (4) blacks were the largest group to respond to the survey; (5) the largest white minority groups to respond were of English, Irish, or Scottish backgrounds; (6) the visible racial minority respondents had more formal education and more specialist qualifications than did other groups; (7) the proportion of visible minorities who applied was larger than the percentage hired for positions as cleaners, educational assistants, and clerks; (8) the proportion of visible minorities who sought mobility within the system is larger than those who obtained promotions and transfers; and (9) male and female candidates tended to apply for sex-stereotyped positions. Statistical data are presented in 13 tables and 6 appendices. (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

1-29-88 UD

ED289953

INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION
Toronto Board of Education

WHO SEEKS THE WORK?
A PRE-EMPLOYMENT PILOT SURVEY

Maisy L. Cheng

#184

RESEARCH SECTION
Library Services Department

UD025971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E.N. Wright
Toronto Bd. of Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ISSN 0316-8786
ISBN 0-88881-192-6

WHO SEEKS THE WORK?
A PRE-EMPLOYMENT PILOT SURVEY

Maisy L. Cheng

#184

November 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
ABSTRACT.	1
INTRODUCTION.	2
DATA COLLECTION METHOD.	5
FINDINGS.	9
Types of Positions for which the Respondents Applied.	9
Characteristics of the Respondents	10
Sources of Information about the Job Vacancies .	13
Similarities and Differences between Visible Minority Applicants and All Applicants	14
Visible Minorities: Their Application Rates and Success Rates in Obtaining Appointments. . .	16
SUMMARY	18
TABLES 1-13	19-28
REFERENCES.	29
Appendix 1.	30
Appendix 2.	32
Appendix 3.	33
Appendix 4.	34
Appendix 5.	35
Appendix 6.	37

ABSTRACT

- The majority of the respondents who applied for non-teaching positions in the Toronto Board of Education in 1986 were external candidates, not currently employed by the Board.

- Newspapers were the major source of information about job openings for external candidates in this survey.

- The proportion of visible/racial minority respondents who sought appointments with the Board (19%) in 1986 was consistent with other estimates of visible minority populations in the Metro Toronto area.

- Blacks constituted the largest group among the visible/racial minority applicants who responded to the survey.

- The largest group of white applicants in this survey was of English/Irish/Scottish background.

- The visible/racial minority respondents, as a group, had attained a higher level of formal education than other respondents. They also tended to have more specialist qualifications than the latter.

- Based on the results of this pilot survey, the proportion of visible minority external applicants who sought employment with the Board seems to be larger than the proportion of visible minorities who succeeded in being hired for positions such as cleaners, educational assistants and clerks.

- According to this study, the proportion of visible minority internal applicants who sought mobility within the Board appears to be larger than the proportion of visible minorities who succeeded in obtaining promotions and transfers.

- Male and female candidates in this survey tended to apply for sex-stereotyped positions in the Board.

INTRODUCTION

The Toronto Board of Education has been an Equal Opportunity employer since 1978. In 1984, the Board approved the following recommendations in the area of employment and promotions:

> (k) That the Director of Education ensure that the following services and functions become the specific responsibility of the Personnel Division: ...
>
> (i) publicizing the Board's equal opportunity policies and practices;
>
> (ii) development and implementation of a coherent policy on Equal Opportunity Employment; ...
>
> (Board Minutes, June 28, 1984, p.622)

In addition, the Board adopted an action plan to increase the representation of racial minorities in the area of hiring. The plan was proposed by the Director of Education and the Superintendent of Personnel in response to a request by the Race Relations Employment Programs Task Force. An extract of the proposal for the plan is presented below:

> Job advertisements should be circulated to community newspapers and similar media. It is also recommended that jobs be advertised in at least two of the Toronto daily newspapers in order to reach as wide a cross-section of the community as possible.
>
> Board policy on equal opportunity should be made available, upon request, to any job applicant. Reference should be made to the existence of an employment and promotion fair practices committee.
>
> A booklet of guidelines for interview procedures and testing procedures should be produced for the use of hiring committees to ensure consistency.
>
> Where possible, interviews should be conducted by a

committee rather than by an individual. Interviewees should be informed that the job interview is to be conducted by a committee.

The feasibility of pre-employment training courses/programs for visible minorities (racial) should be explored with other agencies/institutions.

The Personnel Division should consult with the Equal Opportunity Office to ensure that job advertisements are worded in accordance with standards related to equal opportunity so that visible minority (racial) groups may not be excluded from applying.

The Board's present recruitment procedures should be standardized to eliminate the possibility of uneven practices. It is recommended that when a position is being advertised, the advertisement should stipulate that the application be made in writing and that it will only be accepted within a specific time-frame. The vacant position should not be filled until after the deadline has passed.

For each advertised position, clear selection criteria should be drawn up which should be applied consistently to each application during the selection process.

The selection criteria should be provided to all interviewees before the selection interview, and should be retained on file in the personnel division. This will ensure that a record of the basis on which selection to fill a vacancy was made, is always available.

Workshops/guidelines should be offered to all principals, administrative department heads, and principal officials, which would assist them in the development of clear selection criteria.

(Board Minutes, April 12, 1984, p. 326-329.)

In order to determine the success of these affirmative strategies, data collection at both the pre-employment and post-employment stages is necessary. So far, the Toronto Board of Education has been gathering data at the post-employment stage only. There are two types of post-employment data. One is the work force audit designed to find out if the racial composition of the Board's existing work force reflects the presence of racial minorities in the general population. The first audit, conducted in 1981 (Toronto Board of Education, 1982), was

replicated in the spring of 1987 (Cheng, 1987a). The second type of post-employment data collected by the Toronto Board aims at monitoring the movement of racial minorities through promotions, transfers and new hirings. Such data have been collected on an annual basis during 1985 and 1986 (Tsuji, 1986 and Cheng, 1987b).

The present survey represents the first attempt to collect data at the pre-employment stage. It is designed to ascertain whether a pool of qualified visible minority candidates has sought non-teaching employment with the Board. The second purpose is to determine whether all qualified candidates, regardless of their racial/ethnic origin, show the same rate of success in getting the appointments. The third purpose is to find out which advertising and recruitment system is most effective in reaching potential candidates.

The specific questions that this pilot study attempts to answer are:

1. What are the characteristics of the job applicants in terms of sex, race, employment status and educational qualifications?

2. How do the job applicants find out about the job vacancies in the Toronto Board of Education?

3. How does the proportion of visible minority external applicants compare to the proportion of visible minorities who succeeded in getting employment with the Toronto Board of Education in 1986?

4. How does the proportion of visible minority internal applicants compare to the proportion of visible minorities who succeeded in obtaining transfers or promotions in 1986?

DATA COLLECTION

During the fall of 1986 Research Services, in consultation with the Race Relations Advisor, designed a pre-employment survey form. (See Appendix 1.) The form was submitted to the Ontario Human Rights Commission in December with a request for permission to conduct the survey. The Commission's letter of approval arrived in February 1987. (See Appendix 2.) Permission to collect the pre-employment data was granted under the following conditions:

1. the data collection document be separate and apart from the application for employment form and that it be housed separately;

2. the data on individual applicants will not be made available to Personnel and/or other departments who might be in a position to use the information to contravene the provisions of the Ontario Human Rights Code;

3. the data will only be made available or used upon the permission of the Superintendent of Information Services in consultation with the Race Relations Advisor;

4. the Commission will be apprised of any research on or analysis of the data collected, and its uses.

The next step was to obtain the names and addresses of persons who had applied for positions during 1986 (from January 1 to December 30) from the Personnel Division. Information about the caretaking job applicants was obtained separately from the Plant Operations Department.

There were approximately 350[1] non-teaching job vacancies representing close to 50 types of positions in 1986 in the Toronto Board of Education. About 4500 applicants[2] (85% of whom were external applicants and 15% internal) competed for these job vacancies.

Since this was a pilot survey, it was decided to focus on only a sample of these job files.[3] The following considerations were taken into account in deciding which job files should be pulled for the names and addresses of the applicants:

1. The job files to be included in the survey should have a high percentage of external applicants.
2. The job files selected should represent a cross-section of the Board's various bargaining units or employee groups.
3. For those types of positions that were advertised many times during the year (e.g. educational assistant) only a random sample of such job files was to be pulled.

---

1 These estimates do not include the vacancies in the Maintenance field staff division which relies on the Union "Hiring Hall" practice for recruitments. The only exception is the driver's helper position which was advertised by the Personnel Division.

2 The exact number of applicants is difficult to arrive at, because approximately 17% of the candidates have multiple applications.

3 Each job file contains the application letters and/or resumes of the candidates for one type of position, e.g. Social Worker. In most cases, there was only one vacancy per job file. However, there were a few cases in which two or more vacancies for one type of position were found because the vacancies were advertised simultaneously, e.g. Social Worker (3).

Consequently, 90 files were pulled, from which approximately 2,500 names and addresses were obtained. After eliminating names that appeared more than once (due to multiple applications during the year), the final number of applicants from the 90 job files was reduced to 2,031. (Appendix 3 shows the list of job files that were selected for this survey.)

In April, the mailing address labels and stamped return envelopes were prepared and the survey forms were packaged and mailed out. Most of the completed forms arrived at the Research office in May, although some continued to come in during the following two months. The coding, keypunching and analyses of the data took place in June, July and August.

Of the 2,031 forms mailed out, 83 were returned by the Post Office as undeliverable. Among the remaining 1,948 job seekers with valid addresses, drawn from the 90 job files, 726 (35.7%) completed the forms and mailed them back to the Research office before July 15. The following analyses will be based on the information provided by these 726 forms, which represent over one-third of all the applicants for the 90 job files.

An examination of a few characteristics of these 726 respondents provides some indication that they were quite representative of all the 2,031 job seekers who received the survey forms. Using the driver's helper position as an example, 13% of the forms were sent to the driver's helper applicants and about 14% of the returns were from the same category of

applicants. A second indication was that the sex distribution of all the job applicants for various positions was similar to the sex distribution of those who returned the forms. For example, 7.9% of all the applicants who applied for caretaking positions in 1986 were females. This proportion was almost identical to the proportion of respondents in the survey who were female (8.1%). Another indication was the distribution of last names. For example, when the first letter of the surnames of all caretaking applicants were compared with those who completed the forms, there was no significant difference between the former and the latter in the distribution pattern of the surnames. (See Appendix 4.)

FINDINGS

Types of Positions For Which the Respondents Applied

The largest groups of respondents in this study were those seeking caretaking, clerical, educational assistant, and driver's helper positions. (See Table 1.)

The non-teaching positions applied for by the respondents were classified into different bargaining units or employee groups in Table 2. The positions most frequently applied for were those in CUPE, Local 134, followed by those in CUPE, Locals 1325, 1316 and ATSSS,[4] CUPE, Local 3111 and Drivers and Drivers' Helpers' Association.

Among the 726 respondents who completed the forms, 120 (16.5%) had applied for at least two types of positions in the Toronto Board during 1986. (See Table 3.) For example, some caretaking applicants had also tried for the driver's helper position, and some educational assistant candidates also attempted to obtain a clerical position from the Board.

---

[4] It was decided to combine CUPE, Locals 1325, 1316 and ATSSS in the discussion and tables because there were 64 respondents who did not specify the type of clerical positions applied for.

There were 50 respondents (6.9%) who applied for the same type of position more than once during 1986. Positions that were advertised quite frequently during the year, such as the clerical and educational assistant positions, accounted for most of these multiple applications. (See Table 4.) For example, a few educational assistant applicants in the sample indicated that they had applied simultaneously at various schools and also at different time points to the same schools or different ones during 1986.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Employment Status

The majority (85.7%) of the respondents were currently not employed by the Toronto Board of Education. (See Table 5.) Of the 102 current Board employees (who were already employed by the Board at the time of job application), half were permanent staff. About 60% of those who were Board employees were full-time employees. (See Table 6.) However, due to the high non-response rate of these 102 current Board employees about their permanent/occasional, full-time/part-time status, such findings about this group of respondents are quite tentative.

Sex

About 70% (514) of the respondents were males (see Table 7). It is quite apparent from Table 1 that the job seekers tended to

segregate themselves by sex in the types of positions for which they applied. For example, the caretaker, driver's helper, warehouse helper, labourer, general worker, and shipper/receiver positions, were dominated by male applicants. On the other hand, the educational assistant and clerical positions were over-represented by female candidates.

Race/Ethnicity

Table 7 shows that 19% of the job seekers who returned the survey forms were racial minorities (Blacks, Asians and Native Canadians). This proportion is consistent with the estimates of visible minority population cited in two Toronto publications. A 1981 Employment Utilization Study estimated the visible minority representation in the Metro Toronto population to be between 12% and 20% (City of Toronto, 1981). A subsequent work force survey found that 19% of the Metro Toronto work force in 1984 consisted of visible minorities. (Morin and Halliday, 1985).

The largest group of racial minority respondents who sought appointment with the Toronto Board of Education in 1986 were Blacks (7.0%). This was followed by three groups of Asians: South East Asians (4.4%), South Asians (3.6%), and East Asians (3.0%). The smallest group was the Native Canadians (1.0%). (See Table 7.) Most of the Blacks in this sample had a Caribbean heritage. The three Asian groups were dominated by respondents

of Filipino, East Indian and Chinese origins. (See Appendix 5.)

Among the whites, those of English/Irish/Scottish extraction constituted the largest group. "Canadians" and Italians came second and third. (See Appendix 5.)

Educational Qualifications

Slightly less than half of the applicants who participated in the survey (45.3%) had acquired an educational level above secondary school. (See Table 8.) One-fifth (20.1%) of all the respondents indicated that they had completed their highest level of schooling outside of Canada. Appendix 6 shows the specific countries in which they were educated.

Of the 726 job applicants, 205 (28.2%) indicated that they had at least one specialist certificate/diploma or qualification. Table 9 lists a wide variety of qualifications acquired by these job seekers. There were 33 individuals who reported that these skills were acquired outside of Canada.

Sources of Information about the Job Vacancies

There are a variety of ways that the Personnel Division in the Board advertises non-teaching positions. One way is to post the job ads on bulletin boards in the Education Center, all the Education Offices, and schools. Each administrative department also receives copies of the job ads to be circulated among the staff. Although applications from both internal and external candidates are accepted, first consideration is given to internal candidates in the same bargaining unit as the advertised position. Another way is to place the job ad in the newspapers either simultaneously with the internal postings, or after the effort to fill the position with a suitable internal applicant has failed.

In addition to the above recruitment methods, the Personnel Division has available some general application forms for walk-in job seekers. It also accepts resumes. The forms and/or resumes are acknowledged upon receipt and kept on file for six months for all administrative positions or three months for the educational assistant positions. Such applications are reviewed by the Personnel Division for occasional help or entry level permanent positions, such as clerk 1, which Personnel Division might decide not to advertise externally.

Table 10 lists the sources through which the respondents became aware of the vacancies. The newspaper was the most common source for applicants who were not current employees of the Board. The Toronto Star and The Toronto Sun were the newspapers

most frequently cited as sources of information about the vacancies. (See Table 11.) The Toronto Board of Education advertises mostly professional and supervisory positions in the Globe and Mail; as few such positions were included in this pilot survey, only 4% of applicants indicated that they became aware of the job vacancies through the Globe and Mail.

In 1986, Personnel Division advertised six times in ethnic papers such as the L'Express, the Helenic-Canadian Chronicles and the Ban Viet for bilingual secretary and social worker positions. However, none of the applicants who responded to the survey specified any ethnic paper as a source of information.

Applicants who were already Board employees relied heavily on job postings. (See Table 10.) This is not surprising given their easy access to job ads posted in the various locations of the Board premises. Word of mouth was another source used by one-fourth of the external applicants and one-fifth of the internal applicants in this survey. (See Table 10.)

Similarities and Differences between Visible Minority Applicants and all Applicants

This section will focus on the findings pertaining to the racial minorities (Blacks, Asians and Native Canadians) who participated in this survey. In addition, similarities and differences between these 138 non-white respondents and all respondents will be discussed.

1. The four types of positions most frequently applied for by racial minorities in this study were, in descending order, caretaker, clerk, educational assistant, and driver's helper. These were also the positions for which all respondents most frequently applied. (See Table 1.)

2. 15.2% of the non-white respondents had applied for two or more kinds of positions. Under 5% had applied for three or more types of positions. These patterns were similar to those of all respondents. (See Table 3.)

3. Approximately 7% (10 out of 138) of the racial minority respondents had applied for the same type of position more than once during 1986. This proportion was almost identical to that of the total applicants in this survey. (See page 10.)

4. Slightly under 10% of the non-white respondents were current employees of the Toronto Board of Education. This proportion is somewhat lower than that of all applicants who responded to the questionnaire. (See Table 5.)

5. Similar to the sex distribution of all the respondents, slightly over 70% of the non-white applicants in the survey were males. (See Table 7.)

6. Over half (58.7%) of the racial minority respondents had schooling above the secondary level compared to 45.3% of all applicants. (See Table 8.) The non-whites as a group were better educated than the other applicants who responded to the survey.

7. As expected, the percentage of non-white respondents who acquired their education outside of Canada (47.8%) was substantially greater than that of all respondents (20.1%). (See Appendix 6.) These non-whites were educated mainly in the Caribbean, South East Asia and South Asia.

8. Thirty-eight percent of the non-white respondents (52 out of 138) compared to 28.2% of all respondents (205 out of 726), indicated that they had some specialist certificates/ diplomas or qualifications (See Table 9.) More than half of those who received their certificates outside of Canada were visible minorities.

9. The newspaper was the major source of information about job openings for all respondents including the non-whites. Job postings and word of mouth were the other sources frequently used as well. However, the non-whites tended to be more dependent on the newspaper and less dependent on word of mouth compared to all applicants in the survey. (See Table 10.)

10. The Toronto Sun and The Toronto Star were the two major newspapers the non-white applicants as well as all applicants in this survey read to find out about job vacancies. However, slightly more non-white than all respondents read The Toronto Sun. (See Table 11.)

Visible Minorities: Their Application Rates and Success Rates in Obtaining Appointments

In order to determine whether the visible/racial minorities have the same success as others in obtaining non-teaching positions advertised in 1986, the following comparisons will be made:

1. The proportions of visible minority external applicants (currently not employed by the Board) in this survey will be compared to the proportions of visible minorities who were selected by the Board as successful candidates for non-teaching positions in 1986. The figures for the latter were extracted from another set of data collected in 1986 to update information about staff changes in the Board. (See Cheng, 1987b.)

2. The proportions of visible minority internal applicants (currently employed by the Board) in this survey will be compared to the proportions of visible minorities who succeeded in obtaining promotions and transfers in 1986. The figures for the latter were also obtained from the data source mentioned above.

The assumption behind the comparison of these two sets of rates for both the internal and external visible minority applicants is that equal access is attained when the application rate is close to or equal to the success rate.

Table 12 illustrates that the application rate exceeds the success rate for the visible minorities in new hiring, promotions and transfers. Non-white applicants, in general, tend to have proportionately fewer job offers than their white counterparts. The gap between the application rate and success rate appears to be wider for the external than the internal visible minority candidates.

Table 13 examines the external applicants who responded to this survey in more depth. It reveals that the application rate exceeds the selection rate for the visible/racial minorities for positions in CUPE, Local 3111 (educational assistants), CUPE, Locals 1325/1316 and ATSSS (e.g. clerks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, clerical assistant, secretarial assistant, school community advisor), CUPE, Local 134 (e.g. cleaner), and Drivers and Drivers' Helpers' Association. This shows that visible minority applicants for these positions were underrepresented among the successful candidates.

On the other hand, racial/visible minority applicants for positions in APSSP (e.g. social worker) and Schedule II (e.g. adult education administrator) and Schedule III (e.g. health care assistant) combined appeared to be well represented among the new hires. However, due to the small number of respondents in these categories, the findings for these employee groups have to be interpreted with caution. The APSSP and Schedule II groups, especially, are worth exploring in future studies, given the fact that such positions usually require post secondary educational training, and that a higher percentage of visible minority than white applicants in this survey were found to have this kind of educational qualifications.

Again, due to the small number of internal candidates who participated in this survey, no in-depth comparison of the visible minorities' application rate and success rate in promotions and transfers by bargaining units will be made.

SUMMARY

This section highlights the key findings of the report.

First, the pool of visible minority candidates seeking non-teaching appointments with the Toronto Board of Education in 1986 seems to be proportional to the visible minority work force of Metro Toronto. The group of visible minority applicants who participated in the survey tends to possess higher paper qualifications than the other applicants. They seem to be as motivated as the white candidates in seeking appointments with the Board, judging by the percent who repeatedly applied for a variety of positions or the same type of position in 1986. Yet, they do not appear to have had the same success rate as the other candidates in being hired, promoted or transferred.

The newspapers appear to be the most effective advertising system in reaching potential candidates outside the Board, while internal job postings seemed most effective in reaching internal candidates. Both groups of candidates in this survey also depended on word of mouth to a certain extent.

Finally, the majority of the applicants who responded to the survey were likely to apply for positions which are traditionally held by their gender. This tends to perpetuate occupational segregation by sex in the Toronto Board of Education.

TABLE 2

TYPES OF NON-TEACHING POSITIONS FOR WHICH THE RESPONDENTS APPLIED BY BARGAINING UNITS/EMPLOYEE GROUPS

Bargaining Unit/ Employee Group	Total (N=726)	Percent	Visible Minority (N=138)	Percent
CUPE, Local 134 (e.g. caretaker, general helper, etc.)	450	62.0	87	63.0
CUPE, Local 1325 (e.g. clerks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) CUPE, Local 1316 (e.g. admin. asst.) *ATSSS (e.g. secret'l. asst.)	142	19.6	29	21.0
**CUPE, Local 3111 (e.g. ed. asst.)	108	14.9	16	11.6
Drivers and Drivers' Helpers' Association	102	14.0	13	9.4
Schedule II (e.g. personnel asst., trade supervisor)	16	2.2	3	2.2
***APSSP (e.g. social worker, psycho-ed consultant)	11	1.5	2	1.4
Schedule III (e.g. health care asst., lifeguard)	8	1.1	2	1.4
CUPE 63 (e.g. stationary engineer)	7	1.0	4	2.9
Miscellaneous	4	0.6	0	0

*ATSSS = The Association of the Toronto Secondary School Secretaries.

**The Toronto Educational Assistant Association became CUPE, Local 3111 in 1987.

***APSSP = The Association of Professional Student Services Personnel.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO APPLIED FOR
MORE THAN ONE TYPE OF NON-TEACHING POSITION

Position	All	Percent	Visible Minority	Percent
At least two types	120	16.5	21	15.2
At least three types	26	3.6	6	4.3
At least four types	3	0.4	0	0
Five types	1	0.1	0	0

TABLE 4

TYPES OF NON-TEACHING POSITIONS FOR WHICH THE
SAME RESPONDENTS REPEATEDLY APPLIED DURING 1986 (N=50)

Position	Number of Times Applied						Total # of Respondents
	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Several	
Ed. assistant	2	5	1	2	0	10	20
Clerk, no spec.	7	1	0	0	1	8	17
Admin. assistant	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
Clerk 3	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Clerk 2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Clerk 1	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Personnel assistant	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Clerk 4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Health care asst.	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sch. comm. advisor	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Trade supervisor	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

TABLE 5

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ALL RESPONDENTS

Toronto Board Employee	All	Percent	Visible Minority	Percent
Yes	102	14.0	13	9.4
No	622	85.7	125	90.6
No information	2	0.3	0	0
TOTAL	726	100.0	138	100.0

TABLE 6

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF INTERNAL APPLICANTS

Toronto Board Employee	All	Percent	Visible Minority	Percent
Permanent	51	50.0	6	46.1
Occasional	21	20.6	5	38.5
No information	30	29.4	2	15.4
TOTAL	102	100.0	13	100.0
Full time	61	59.8	6	46.1
Part time	22	21.6	2	15.4
No information	19	18.6	5	38.5
TOTAL	102	100.0	13	100.0

TABLE 1

TYPES OF NON-TEACHING POSITIONS FOR WHICH THE RESPONDENTS APPLIED DURING 1986

Position*	% of Visible Minority Respondents (N=138)	% of All Respondents (N=726)	Per Position(s) % of Male Respondents (N=514)	Per Position(s) % of Female Respondents (N=212)
Caretaker	59.4	57.6	91.9	8.1
Clerk (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, supply clerk, admin. asst., no spec.)	17.4	16.4	21.0	79.0
Educational assistant	11.6	14.9	8.3	91.7
Driver's helper	9.4	14.0	99.0	1.0
Warehouse helper/ labourer/general worker/shipper	3.6	5.9	97.7	2.3
Adult ed. administrator/ project coordinator	1.4	1.2	44.4	55.6
Social worker/street worker/court worker	1.4	1.0	14.3	85.7
Stationary engineer	2.9	1.0	100.0	0
Personnel assistant	0.7	0.8	33.3	66.7
Instructional Media/ Computer/Library technicians	0.7	0.8	66.7	33.3
School community advisor	2.2	0.7	40.0	60.0
Psychoed. consultant	0	0.6	0	100.0
Trade supervisor	0	0.4	100.0	0
Carpenter/plumber/ mechanic	0	0.4	100.0	0
Health care assistant	1.4	0.4	0	100.0
Lifeguard/swim instructor	0	0.4	33.3	66.7
Cook	0.7	0.3	0	100.0

*Some respondents mentioned other positions applied for in addition to those selected by the author.

TABLE 7

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS: RACE BY SEX

Race	Male	Female	Total	Percent
White	389	171	560	77.1
Black	32	19	51	7.0
South East Asian	26	6	32	4.4
South Asian	20	6	26	3.6
East Asian	18	4	22	3.0
Native Canadian	6	1	7	1.0
Other or no information	23	5	28	3.9
TOTAL	514	212	726	100.0

TABLE 8

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF THE RESPONDENTS

Highest Level of Education	Total	Percent	Visible Minority	Percent
Some elementary school	7	1.0	2	1.4
Elementary school	9	1.2	0	0
Some secondary school	157	21.6	27	19.6
Secondary school	207	28.5	28	20.3
Some post secondary school	112	15.4	21	15.2
Community college	116	16.0	31	22.5
University	69	9.5	22	15.9
Graduate degree	32	4.4	7	5.1
No information	17	2.3	0	0
TOTAL	726	99.9	138	100.0

TABLE 9

TYPES OF SPECIALIST CERTIFICATE/QUALIFICATIONS ACQUIRED BY THE RESPONDENTS

Certificate/Qualifications*	Within & Outside Canada		Outside Canada	
	All (N=205)	Vis. Min. (N=52)	All (N=33)	Vis. Min. (N=20)
Class A or D driver's license/ safe driving/operating forklift truck	35	5	0	0
First aid/St. Johns Ambulance/ CPR/medical assistance/health and safety	32	6	0	0
Stationary engineer	16	5	0	0
Secretarial/word processing	16	5	3	1
Early Childhood Education/ ed. assistant	14	5	0	0
Mechanic	11	3	3	3
Teacher	11	5	7	4
Accounting/bookkeeping/ business	9	5	5	5
Welding	9	1	0	0
Swim/scuba diving instructor	6	1	1	1
Real estate/insurance	5	0	1	0
ESL (English as Second Language)	5	2	0	0
Data processing	5	4	0	0
Drafting	5	0	1	0
Supervisory management	5	1	0	0
Miscellaneous	98	29	20	14

*Some respondents have acquired more than one specialist qualification; therefore, the sum of qualifications does not equal the number of applicants.

TABLE 10

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE VACANT POSITIONS

Sources	% of All Respondents* (N=726)	% of External Applicants* (N=622)	*% of Internal Applicants* (N=102)	% of Visible Minority Respondents* (N=138)
Newspaper	59.8	67.7	11.8	64.5
Word of Mouth	24.7	25.1	21.6	18.8
Job Posting	23.0	14.5	75.5	21.0
Contacted by Personnel/ Submitted Resumes	9.9	8.5	18.6	10.9
Others	1.2	1.1	2.0	1.4

*Some respondents indicated more than one source; therefore, the total percentage may add up to more than 100%.

TABLE 11

NEWSPAPERS THROUGH WHICH APPLICANTS
HEARD ABOUT THE VACANT POSITIONS

Newspaper	Total	Percent* (N=434)	Visible Minority	Percent* (N=89)
Toronto Sun	205	47.2	47	52.8
Toronto Star	195	44.9	37	41.6
Globe and Mail **	17	3.9	4	4.5
Scarborough Mirror	1	0.2	0	0
Mississauga News	1	0.2	0	0
Unspecified	27	6.2	3	3.4

* Some respondents indicated more than one newspaper; therefore, the total percentages may add up to more than 100%.

**Because only professional and supervisory positions are advertised in the Globe and Mail, and because few such positions are included in this pilot survey, the number of Globe and Mail readers is necessarily small.

TABLE 12

THE APPLICATION RATES AND SUCCESS RATES OF VISIBLE MINORITIES IN OBTAINING APPOINTMENTS IN THE TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION IN 1986

	External Candidates		Internal Candidates		
	Application Rate	Success Rate* in New Hiring	Application Rate	Success Rates** in Promotion	Transfer
Vis. Min.	125	24	13	6	8
Total	622	278	102	62	79
% of Vis. Min.	20.1	8.6	12.7	9.7	10.1

*New hires from both the administrative and Maintenance and Plant Operations field staff divisions were included in the calculation of success rate. The success rate was computed from another set of data collected in 1986 to monitor staff changes in the Board. The figures can be found in pp. 9 and 11 of an earlier report (Cheng, 1987b).

**In order to have a meaningful comparison, only the administrative division was included in the computation of success rate, because there were no visible minority internal applicants in the pilot study who applied for Maintenance and Plant Operations field positions. The success rates of visible minority administrative staff were computed from the same data source mentioned above. The figures can be found on p. 20 of an earlier report (Cheng, 1987b).

NOTE: The reader should focus on the proportions rather than the actual numbers because the information on the applicants included only those candidates from 90 job files who responded to the survey, whereas the information on the successful candidates included everyone who filled vacant non-teaching positions in the Toronto Board during 1986.

TABLE 13

THE APPLICATION RATES AND SUCCESS RATES OF VISIBLE MINORITY EXTERNAL CANDIDATES IN ACQUIRING NON-TEACHING POSITIONS IN THE TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION, BY BARGAINING UNITS, 1986

Bargaining Units/ Employee Groups	External Applicants in this survey			New Hires*		
	Vis. Min. (N=125)	Total (N=622)	% Vis. Min	Vis. Min.	Total	% of Vis. Min.
CUPE, Local 3111 (ed. asst.)	13	56	23.2	12	132	9.1
CUPE, Locals 1325, 1316 & ATSSS (e.g. clericals)	18	85	21.2	5	61	8.2
CUPE, Local 134 (e.g. cleaner, cook)	87	431	20.2	2**	52**	3.8
Drivers and Drivers' Helpers' Assn.	13	97	13.4	0	1***	0
APSSP (e.g. social worker), Schedule II (e.g. adult ed. admin.) and Schedule III (e.g. health care asst.)	4****	17	23.5	5	20	25.0

*The figures for these columns were extracted from another set of data collected in 1986 to monitor the proportion of visible minorities actually hired in the Toronto Board of Education during that year.

**The number of candidates selected for cleaners was higher than the number hired in 1986. Some successful candidates were on the waiting list to be placed later.

***Only one driver's helper was appointed to permanent staff in 1986 after completing a probationary period of twelve continuous months of employment. However, the number of drivers' helpers hired in 1986 was four.

****Two APSSP and three Schedule II job files containing the applications of external candidates were accidentally omitted from the study. Consequently, the number of external applicants who participated in this survey from these two employee groups is small.

NOTE: Also see the note to Table 12.

REFERENCES

Cheng, M. L. (a), Representation of visible/racial minorities in the Toronto Board of Education work force, 1987. Part I. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Services, 1987, (#186).

Cheng, M. L. (b), Visible Minority representation in the Toronto Board of Education: staff changes, 1986. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Tornto, Research Services, 1987, (#183).

Equal Opportunity Division, Management Services Department, City of Toronto, Employment utilization study. Toronto: City of Toronto, December, 1981.

Morin, B. H. and Halliday, S., E.E.O.: first report. Toronto, Ontario, Equal Employment Opportunity, Chief Administrative Officer's Department, Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, May 21, 1985.

Toronto Board of Education, Board minutes, June 24, 1982, pp. 671-672.

Toronto Board of Education, Board minutes, April 12, 1984, pp. 326-329.

Toronto Board of Education, Board minutes, June 28, 1984, pp. 618-625.

Tsuji, G. K., Visible minority representation in Toronto Board of Education: staff changes, 1985. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Services, 1986, (#178).

Appendix 1

Date _____

TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION
FOR ALL FULL-TIME JOB APPLICANTS

As an Equal Opportunity employer, the Toronto Board of Education is committed to ensuring that its staff is representative of the diversity of the community. In order to monitor the success of our Equal Opportunity programs, we need to know whether qualified people from all racial/ethnic backgrounds are applying for jobs with us. We request your cooperation in providing the information we need by filling out this form. COMPLETING THIS FORM IS ENTIRELY VOLUNTARY AND IN NO WAY AFFECTS YOUR APPLICATION. FURTHER, THE INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT IN THE RESEARCH OFFICE AND WILL NOT BE SEEN BY THE PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT.

Helen I. Sissons
Associate Director of
Education - Personnel

Please return the completed form to:

Research Services
Toronto Board of Education
155 College Street
Toronto, Ontario M5T 1P6

If you have any questions or need assistance, call:
Alok Mukherjee, Equal Opportunity Office: 591-8213
Maisy Cheng, Research Services: 591-8287
Suzanne Ziegler, Research Services: 591-8287

* *

1. Your Name: _____
(If you do not wish to fill in your name, but are willing to provide the rest of the information, please do so.)

2. Your sex: ___ Male ___ Female

3. Position(s) applied for during 1986: _____

_____

_____

3. How did you find out about this (these) job(s)? Please check and/or fill in the appropriate blank(s).

___ Newspaper; specify which one(s), e.g. Toronto Star: _____

___ Job postings

___ Word of mouth

___ Contacted by Personnel which had my resume on file

___ Other; please describe: _____

5. Are you at present an employee of the Toronto Board of Education?

___ Yes; circle also (i) and (ii)

(i) full time or part time

(ii) permanent or occasional

___ No

6. a) What is the highest level of schooling you have completed and where?

Level	Within Canada (specify the province)	or Outside Canada (specify the country)
___ some elementary school	_____	_____
___ completed elementary school	_____	_____
___ some secondary school	_____	_____
___ secondary school diploma	_____	_____
___ some post-secondary education	_____	_____
___ community college diploma	_____	_____
___ university degree	_____	_____
___ graduate degree	_____	_____
___ other, specify: _____	_____	_____

6. b) If you have any specialist certificate(s), please specify which type (e.g. special education teaching certificate) and where acquired.

Types of specialist certificate	Within Canada (specify the province)	or Outside Canada (specify the country)
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

7. To what racial group do you belong? (Identify one only, and write the name of your specific racial origin on the appropriate line.)

_____ Black (SPECIFY: e.g. African, Afro-Canadian, Caribbean, etc.)

_____ White (SPECIFY: e.g. Portuguese, English, Greek, Chilean, etc.)

_____ Native Canadian Indian, Inuit or Metis

_____ East Asian Descent (SPECIFY: e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, etc.)

_____ South Asian Descent (SPECIFY: e.g. East Indian, Pakistani, etc.)

_____ South-East Asian Descent (SPECIFY: e.g. Filipino, Laotian, Malaysian, Vietnamese, etc.)

_____ Other (SPECIFY: if not included above, or any combination of the above.)

THANK YOU!

Ontario Human Rights Commission / Commission ontarienne des droits de la personne

Appendix 2

Please quote File No. on all correspondence / Veuillez mentionner le No. de dossier dans toute correspondance

400 University Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1T7

416/965-6841

February 25, 1987

VIA COURIER

Mr. Alok Mukherjee
Advisor-Race Relations Division
The Board of Education for the
City of Toronto
155 College Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5T 1P6

Dear Mr. Mukherjee:

Re: Toronto Board of Education
Pre-Employment Data Collection Request

With respect to your letter of January 15, 1987 with enclosures, please be advised that the Commission has had the opportunity to review your Board's submission requesting permission to collect pre-employment data on your applicant pool as part of its overall employment equity initiative.

The Commission has granted your Board permission to collect this data, on the understanding that:

(1) the data collection document be separate and apart from the application for employment form and that it be housed separately;

(2) the individual data applicants will not be made available to the personnel and/or other departments who might be in a position to use the information to contravene the provisions of the Ontario Human Rights Code;

(3) the data will be only made available or used upon the permission of the Superintendent for Information Services in consultation with the Race Relations Advisor;

4) the Commission will be apprised of any research or analysis of the data collected, and, its uses.

Your Board can cite special program No. 65 as the number granting permission to your board to collect the data.

If you have any further questions or if I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at 965-6841.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Nakamura
Conciliation & Compliance
(Metro)

MN:dr

Appendix 3

LIST OF JOB FILES SELECTED FOR THE SURVEY

Type of Position	No. of Job Files	No. of Vacancies
Supply clerk, warehouse	2	2
Clerk 1	5	5
Clerk 2	14	14
Clerk 3	6	6
Clerk 4	1	1
Secretary assistant	4	4
Clerical assistant	18	18
Administrative assistant	4	4
Personnel assistant	1	1
Carpenter trade supervisor	3	3
Adult ed. administrator	1	1
School community advisor	1	2
Psychoed. consultant	2	2
Social worker	3	3
Library resource technician	1	1
Health care assistant	2	2
Drivers' helper	1	4
Educational assistant	19	19
Caretaker	1	59
Co-ordinator of Riverdale Project	1	1
Total	90	152

Appendix 4

DISTRIBUTION OF CARETAKER APPLICANTS BY FIRST LETTER OF FAMILY NAME

	All Applicants		Applicants Who Returned the Forms	
	Number	%	Number	%*
A	42	4.2	18	4.4
B	95	9.6	33	8.1
C	71	7.2	29	7.1
D	65	6.6	27	6.6
E & F	48	4.8	19	4.7
G	53	5.4	21	5.2
H	46	4.6	18	4.4
I, J & K	61	6.2	29	7.1
L	49	4.9	23	5.7
M	112	11.3	49	12.0
N & O	50	5.1	22	5.4
P & Q	50	5.1	24	5.9
R	46	4.6	25	6.1
S	87	8.8	37	9.1
T	45	4.5	12	3.0
U to Z	70	7.1	21	5.2
No info.			9	-
Total	990	100.0	416	100.0

*These percentages were calculated on the basis of those who gave their family name (N=407).

The null hypothesis that the family name distribution of the caretaker applicants in the sample did not differ significantly from that of all caretaker applicants was accepted at the .05 level with 15 degrees of freedom.

Appendix 5

RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF THE RESPONDENTS

Racial/Ethnic Background	Number	%
White	560	77.1
English/Irish/Scottish	247	34.0
Canadian	90	12.4
Italian	72	9.9
Portuguese	17	2.3
Greek/Macedonian	17	2.3
French Canadian/French	16	2.2
Polish	12	1.7
European	12	1.7
Ukrainian	10	1.4
German	7	1.0
Jewish	5	0.7
Chilean	4	0.6
Hungarian	4	0.6
Yugoslavian	4	0.6
Hamite-Maltese/Maltese	4	0.6
Czech	3	0.4
Dutch	3	0.4
Peruvian	2	0.3
Anglo Celtic	1	0.1
Caribbean	1	0.1
South African	1	0.1
Australian	1	0.1
Bulgarian	1	0.1
Belgian	1	0.1
American	1	0.1
Iranian	1	0.1
Austrian	1	0.1
Estonian	1	0.1
El Salvadorian	1	0.1
Croatian	1	0.1
Columbian	1	0.1
Norwegian	1	0.1
Danish	1	0.1
Hispanic	1	0.1
Ecuadorian	1	0.1
Guatemalan	1	0.1
Russian	1	0.1
Argentinian	1	0.1
Lithuanian	1	0.1
No information	10	1.4

(continued)

Appendix 5 (continued)

RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Racial/Ethnic Background	Number	Percent
Black	51	7.0
Caribbean	27	3.7
Afro Canadian/Canadian	10	1.4
African	5	0.7
Jamaican	3	0.4
West Indian	2	0.3
American	1	0.1
No information	3	0.4
South East Asian	32	4.4
Filipino	23	3.2
Vietnamese	9	1.2
South Asian	26	3.6
East Indian	13	1.8
Indo Guyanese	5	0.7
Sri Lankan	2	0.3
Pakistani	2	0.3
West Indian	2	0.3
No information	2	0.3
East Asian	22	3.0
Chinese	18	2.5
Korean	1	0.1
Japanese	1	0.1
Canadian	1	0.1
No information	1	0.1
Native Canadian	7	1.0
Cree Indian	2	0.3
Metis Indian	2	0.3
Algonquin Indian	1	0.1
No information	2	0.3
Other or no information	28	3.9
TOTAL	726	100.0

Appendix 6

COUNTRY WHERE THE RESPONDENT COMPLETED HIS/HER HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Country	Total	Percent	Visible Minority	Percent
Canada	**577**	**79.5**	**72**	**52.2**
Ontario	452	62.2	58	42.0
Nova Scotia	10	1.4	2	1.4
Quebec	7	1.0	1	0.7
British Columbia	5	0.7	1	0.7
Alberta	4	0.6	1	0.7
New Brunswick	4	0.6	0	0
Saskatchewan	1	0.1	0	0
Manitoba	1	0.1	0	0
Canada (no specification of province)	93	12.8	9	6.5
Outside Canada	**146**	**20.1**	**66**	**47.8**
North America				
U.S.A.	11	1.5	2	1.4
South America				
Guyana	7	1.0	5	3.6
Chile	2	0.3	0	0
Columbia	1	0.1	0	0
Peru	1	0.1	0	0
Ecuador	1	0.1	0	0
Argentina	1	0.1	0	0
Central America				
El Salvador	1	0.1	0	0
Caribbean Region				
Trinidad	6	0.8	4	2.9
Jamaica	5	0.7	3	2.2
Grenada	3	0.4	3	2.2

(continued)

Appendix 6 (continued)

Country Where the Respondent Completed His/Her Highest Level of Education

Country	Total	Percent	Visible Minority	Percent
Europe				
U.K.	16	2.2	2	1.4
Italy	12	1.6	0	0
Portugal	6	0.8	0	0
Poland	5	0.7	0	0
Yugoslavia	2	0.3	0	0
Germany	2	0.3	0	0
Czechoslovakia	2	0.3	0	0
Malta	2	0.3	0	0
Austria	1	0.1	0	0
Greece	1	0.1	0	0
Bulgaria	1	0.1	0	0
Luxembourg	1	0.1	0	0
Lithuania	1	0.1	0	0
Middle East				
Iran	1	0.1	0	0
Iraq	1	0.1	0	0
East Asia				
Hong Kong	2	0.3	2	1.4
Korea	1	0.1	1	0.7
South East Asia				
Philippines	20	2.7	19	13.8
Vietnam	10	1.4	10	7.2
South Asia				
India	7	1.0	7	5.1
Sri Lanka	2	0.3	2	1.4
Pakistan	2	0.3	2	1.4
Afghanistan	1	0.1	0	0

(continued)

Appendix 6 (continued)

COUNTRY WHERE THE RESPONDENT COMPLETED
HIS/HER HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Country	Total	Percent	Visible Minority	Percent
Oceania				
Australia	1	0.1	0	0
Fiji	1	0.1	1	0.7
Africa				
Ethiopia	2	0.3	2	1.4
South Africa	1	0.1	0	0
Egypt	1	0.1	0	0
Mauritius	1	0.1	0	0
Africa (no specification of country)	1	0.1	1	0.7
No information	3	0.4	0	0
TOTAL	726	100.0	138	100.0